(DR. R. NAGAN GOWDA.)

given. Regarding Kodihalli, load survey forms have been received and the scheme has been taken up for investigation.

(c) (i) Availability of power to cater to the needs and adequacy of return.

(ii) In the case of rural electrification schemes, the return should be 7.5 per cent for Maidan and 5 per cent for Malnad areas.

(iii) In the case of power supply to irrigation pumps the cost per H. P. should not exceed Rs. 1,000.

Lands granted to Harijans in Kolar District (Restoration from Jamindars)

Q.—921. Sri J. NARAYANAPPA (Chintamani—Scheduled Castes).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether it has come to their notice that Jamindars are getting into their possession lands given by Government to Harijans in Kolar District under concession rules and Grow More Food Scheme';

(b) if there are such instances, whether the Government would give back to the Harijans their lands ?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(a) It has come to the notice of Government that in a few cases, the Harijans to whom land had been granted under Depressed Class darkhast Rules have sold their lands contrary to the condition of the grant.

(b) Each case is being dealt with according to rules.

Disposal of questions requiring answers.

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ಎಂ. ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರಯ್ಯ.—ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಉತ್ತರವೇ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ; ಇನ್ನೆರ್ಲಾ 3-4 ದಿವಸಗಳುಮಾತ್ರ ಈ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಉತ್ತರ ತರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Re **Strike in the Kolar Gold Mines.**

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri S. Gopala Gowda has sent an adjournment motion which reads as follows :—

> "That this House do now stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence to wit, the situation arising out of the strike of the workers of the Gold Mines at Kolar Gold Field reported to have commenced from 16th April 1955."

It needs no discussion or even a statement to be made, because, as the Hon'ble Members are aware, there are several rulings of our own legislature to the effect that strikes and lock-outs cannot be proper subject of adjournment motion. These rulings are based on similar rulings given in other legislatures and are so well-known that it is not necessary to refer to them at length. On this occasion, I hold that this adjournment motion is not in order.

Sri G. PUTTASWAMY (Chikmagalur-Mudigere—Scheduled Castes).—What about my short notice question which I had tabled about five days back, Sir ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is being considered and sent to the Minister for his consent.

Now the next item that is the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1955.

MYSORE APPROPRIATION (No. 3) BILL, 1955.

Motion to consider.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, I beg to introduce the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1955. I also move that it may be taken into consideration.

This motion, I submit Sir, in my opinion does not require much discussion, because the Appropriation Accounts of 1950-51, the Audit Report

of 1952 and the Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the same subject have been discussed at length. Further, Sir, while moving for the Excess Grants in respect of Appropriation Bill, there was considerable discussion thereon. As a matter of fact, the net aggregate grant for 1950-51 was 27·01 crores of rupees voted. The aggregate disbursement was 22·2 crores leaving a saving of Rs. 4·82 crores which is arrived at after taking into consideration the excesses also. There is therefore no excess. It is also stated in page 7 of the Public Accounts Committee Report that if the Heads of Departments had taken timely action those excesses would have been regularised then alone. My submission is that it is only a formality to go through because these accounts are already four years old.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This question has been discussed during the debate on this Demands for Excess Grants.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—So, Sir, with these few remarks, I introduce and move this Bill.

*Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I rise to a point of order Sir. This huge amount of Rs. 1,28,00,000 was spent nearly four years ago. I think that amount was spent by a different Government at a time when there was quite a different legislature and I believe this amount must have been appropriated from a fund or from the general treasuries at that time and the constitution was also quite different. Now after a period of four or five years the present Government wants to regularise it. Now they want to appropriate this sum out of a Consolidated Fund that existed five years ago. There was no Consolidated Fund then. This must have been met from some other source. Now my point is this: because this is the first time that such an incident has risen, I would like to know whether the present Government is competent to regularise the amount which was spent irregularly by the previous government and whether the present House is competent to approve this when there was quite a different legislature at that time and it was the duty of that legislature to have given approval. And thirdly, now is it open to the present Government to appropriate this amout out of the consolidated fund which never existed then? I think, this motion ought not have been brought before this House and this House has no power to approve of the expenditure.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I think, Sir, the principle is simple. The Government and the Legislature are continuing institutions and they never terminate. Let us hope it will not terminate now either. Sir, as could be seen in section 3 "the sums to be paid and applied from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State by this Act shall be appropriated, and shall be deemed to have been appropriated, for the services and purposes expressed in the Schedule in relation to the financial year ended on the 31st day of March 1951."

Sir, though the terminology 'Consolidated Fund' might not have been used at that time, there were the resources of the Government then as well as now. Therefore that technical difficulty does not arise. As I have already submitted, out of Rs. 27·01 crores voted for at the time the actuals were 22·2 crores. Thus a balance of Rs. 4·82 crores were left. Even those excess grants were calculated and they have been adjusted already. It is only a technical and formal measure which I have introduced, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The only point raised is whether there was a Consolidated Fund then. I think even the legislature which came into being later is entitled to pass this Bill.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—How can we get money from a source which never existed?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The source was always there but only the name was not there. Whatever sources were there should be deemed to be Consolidated Fund.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is a provision to the effect in the Constitution also that the old excess grants after perusal by the Public Accounts Committee can be regularised. Accordingly,

* Asterisk indicates that the speeches and remarks made are not revised by the Member concerned.

(MR. SPEAKER.)

this Appropriation Bill has been brought forward. Hon'ble Members have discussed this subject during the debate on excess grants. During the course of discussion, this point whether this Government had authority to bring this appropriation Bill was also raised. Therefore there is no illegality so far as this Bill is concerned.

Motion moved :

"That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1955 be taken into consideration."

1 P.M.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ(ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ):—ನಾನು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನೀಗ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏಷ್ಟು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೂ ಏರಿ ಹಿಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋದ ನೀರಿನಂತೆಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತು. ಆದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವಿವೇಕರಹಿತವಾದ ವರ್ತನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮಿಲಿಟರಿಯವರನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್ ಥಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪೆರ್ಷ್ಷ ಹೊರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೀಳಲು ಕಾರಣವಾಯಿತು. ಈ ಸೈನಿಕರು ಏಷ್ಟೋ ಕಡೆ ಧಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೂ, ಹಿಂದಿನ ಮಹಾಯುದ್ಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಆ ಬರ್ಮಾ ಯುದ್ಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಹೋಗಿ ಹೆಸರುವಾಸಿಯನ್ನು ಗಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೂ ಅಂಥವರನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈಗ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏಕ್‌ದಂ ಡಿಸ್‌ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿವೇಕವನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಪೆರ್ಷ್ಷ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ತಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಹೀಗೆ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ದುಷ್ಪರಿಣಾಮವನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ಅವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪೆರ್ಷ್ಷ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹುಣಸೂರು ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ರೀಹ್ಯಾಬಿಲಿಟೇಷನ್ನಿಗಾಗಿ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಮಿಲಿಟರಿಯನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಮ್ಮ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರೇಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಏಕ್‌ದಂ 2,600 ಜನರನ್ನು ಒಂದೇ ಸಾರ್ತಿಗೆ ಡಿಸ್‌ಥಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಹೀಗೆ ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ರಿಲೀವ್ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲ ನಮಗೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರು ಕಾಶ್ಮೀರ, ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಕಡೆಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೋಗಿ ಹೆಸರು ವಾಸಿ ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆಗ್ಗೂ ಇವರು ಮೈಸೂರು ಮಿಲಿಟರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇವರನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಿ ಬಾಕಿ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಮಿಲಿಟರಿಯವರನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅವರು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ರೀಟೈನ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ನಿರ್ಭಾಗ್ಯ ನಾಕರರು ಅನೇಕ ಕಷ್ಟನಷ್ಟಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಭವಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾದ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊರಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ನಾನ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಇದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕಾರಣಕರ್ತರಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ತನಕ ಇವರಿಗೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಏನೇನು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಆ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ಮುಂದೆ ಇವರಿಗಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಮೊಬಲಗು ಎಷ್ಟಿದೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಈ ಎರಡು ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನೂ ಅವರಿಂದ ವಸೂಲ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಪಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಈ ಮಿಲಿಟರಿಯನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ವರಮಾನದ ಬಾಬ್ತು ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳನ್ನು ಜೇರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಿದ್ದಾಯಿತು. ಆ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಆದಾಯ ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅವರು ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ದರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತರಷ್ಟು ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರ ಕೈಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡ ನಂತರ ನಮ್ಮ ಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ದುಬಾರಿ ತರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇರಿದ್ದು ನ್ಯಾಯ ಪಾದದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆಗಾಗಿ ಒದ್ದಾಡದೆ ಈ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬೀಳುವ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಇಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪಡಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಎರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Sri S. SRINIVASAIYENGAR (T.-Narsipur).—I oppose this Bill. The Appropriation Bill (No. 3) has three clauses. Clause 2 requests us to authorise the issue of Rs. 1,28,95,700 out of the Consolidated Fund of the State for the year ended 31st March 1951. The Leader of the Opposition has already raised a point of order to the effect that such a fund did not exist prior to March 1951; and now there is a clause here asking us to authorise the issue of a particular amount out of a fund that never existed on that date. I think that cannot be done by us. We cannot imagine the existence of a fund and then proceed to issue some money out of that fund. It is very clear in this clause. It states that we have to issue a certain amount out of a fund that existed prior to 31st March 1951. Actually, no such fund existed then and therefore the issue cannot arise. I can understand the Minister's observation that there

has been savings in that year. The Government is not seeking authority to spend more than what had been permitted by the Legislature for expenditure. There has been actual savings. I perfectly know that point. But the point is that that expenditure which has been incurred by the Government is to be legalised. That is all the object—only legalisation of that expenditure. When the Consolidated Fund did not exist, some other fund did exist then. Prior to 31st March 1951, the funds of the State were called by some name. Out of those funds, you want the legalising of the expenditure by the Government. That fund is something other than the Consolidated Fund and therefore, we cannot agree to a clause which says that there was a Consolidated Fund prior to 31st March 1951 and that we authorise the Government to issue or we issue to Government so much of money to meet expenditure in connection with such and such purpose. That thing cannot happen. I think there is a technical objection and it is best that Government should examine the issue before making this Bill into a law.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I am advised by the Finance Department that the fund did exist and there need be no apprehension on that point. A few minutes earlier, I pointed out that though the fund could not or did not exist, yet there were the assets which subsequently formed part of the Consolidated Fund and on which we could draw. Now I am advised by the Finance Department that the fund existed and therefore, the technical difficulty dose not arise.

Next, it was pointed out that the liabilities or expenditure in respect of military pensions should have been taken up by the Government of India and even now that that point should be urged. Two points arose at the time. One was the demobilisation of soldiers. Mysore had an army of its own. It had gone for war service. In that year they were demobilised, that is, part of the army. With the integration of India, the separate forces of various States were abolished in the sense that they formed a screening committee, absorbed as many as possible and those that could not be absorbed had to be retired. Therefore, the liability of Mysore both in respect of demobilisation as well as in respect of those who were not absorbed by the Indian Army clearly lay with the Government of Mysore. Further, I may point out that this aspect of the question was also taken into consideration during the time of financial integration. Even so, if there is any other point, we will consider that and we thank the Hon'ble Member for drawing attention to that factor. Thus, both on technical grounds and on merits, I submit the Opposition has little or no case. As could be seen in the preamble of the Act itself, this is to provide for the authorisation of appropriation. In fact, it has been appropriated. It only wanted authorisation and for such authorisation, we have come to the House and I trust that the Hon'ble Members will give that authorisation without any hesitation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now clauses of the Bill. Clauses 2 and 3. The question is:

"That Clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Schedule. The question is:

"That the Schedule form part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1. The question is:

"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Title and Preamble. The question is :

"That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1955 be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1955, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE MADRAS GENERAL SALES TAX (MYSORE AMENDMENT) BILL, 1955.

Motion to consider.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Miniser for Revenue and Public Works).— I beg to move :

"That the Madras General Sales Tax (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration."

This is a very simple measure. Under the existing section 3 of the Act provision has been made for collecting sales-tax on the turnover of the assessee for each year. According to the rules framed, provision has been made to collect tax in advance pending final assessment. The Madras High Court has held that in the absence of definite provisions in the Act, tax cannot be levied and collected in advance pending final assessment. Therefore, to regularise the procedure so far adopted, this measure has been introduced. We are not introducing a novel procedure. Even after this Bill becomes law, the procedure that is so far being adopted will be followed. When the other Bill was discussed, it was contended by some Hon'ble Members that we proposed to collect sales-tax in the absence of turnover. It is not correct. The other Bill which seeks to introduce a similar provision in the Mysore Sales-Tax Act had been referred to the Select Committee. The Select Committee considered the objection raised on the floor of this House and have amended the provisions relating to the advance levy. I have proposed a similar amendment to this Bill also. With the annexure, the copies of the Bill have been distributed.

There is therefore no difficulty in accepting this measure. The amount which will fall due by way of tax will be collected at the end of the month or the quarter, as the case may be. Therefore tax will not be collected in the absence of the turnover as contended by some Hon'ble Members when the provisions of the other Bill were discussed at length on the floor of this House. I commend this measure to the acceptance of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Madras General Sales Tax (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration."

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I would like to know when the Sales-tax will become uniform and when it will be applied to Bellary. All this confusion is because we have two different sets of laws. The people of Bellary are anxious that there should be a common law. The sooner the Mysore law is applied to Bellary the less trouble there will be.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—There is a lot of force in the point raised by the Hon'ble Member. Recently the Bill which provides for the extension of Mysore Sales Tax to Bellary has been passed by this House. It has to be passed by the other House. Afterwards we propose to extend the Mysore Sales Tax Act to Bellary as early as possible.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Madras General Sales Tax (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.